arXiv:math/0302137v1 [math.AP] 12 Feb 2003

EXISTENCE AND MULTIPLICITY FOR PERTURBATIONS OF AN EQUATION INVOLVING HARDY INEQUALITY AND CRITICAL SOBOLEV EXPONENT IN THE WHOLE $I\!\!R^N$.

B. ABDELLAOUI, V. FELLI, & I. PERAL

Abstract. In order to obtain solutions to problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \dfrac{A+h(x)}{|x|^2}u + k(x)u^{2^*-1},\ x \in I\!\!R^N, \\ u>0 \text{ in } I\!\!R^N,\ \text{and } u \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!\!R^N), \end{cases}$$

h and k must be chosen taking into account not only the size of some norm but the shape. Moreover, if $h(x)\equiv 0$, to reach multiplicity of solution, some hypotheses about the local behaviour of k close to the points of maximum are needed.

1. Introduction

In this paper we will consider the following class of problems

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \Big(\dfrac{A+h(x)}{|x|^2}\Big)u + k(x)u^{2^*-1},\ x \in I\!\!R^N, \\ u>0 \text{ in } I\!\!R^N,\ \text{and } u \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!\!R^N), \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where $N\geq 3$, $2^*=\frac{2N}{N-2}$ and h, k are continuous bounded functions, for which we will state appropriate complementary hypotheses. Here $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!\!R^N)$ denotes the closure space of $\mathcal{C}_0^\infty(I\!\!R^N)$ with respect to the norm

$$||u||_{\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!\!R^N)} := \left(\int_{I\!\!R^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx\right)^{1/2}.$$

By the Sobolev inequality we can see that $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!\!R^N)$ is the class of functions in $L^{2^*}(I\!\!R^N)$ the distributional gradient of which satisfies $\big(\int_{I\!\!R^N}|\nabla u|^2dx\big)^{1/2}<\infty$.

For $h\equiv 0, k\equiv 1$ the problem is studied by S. Terracini in [18]. In [11] the existence of a positive solution is proved in the case $h=0$ by using the perturbative method by Ambrosetti-Badiale in [2], even for a more general class of differential operators related to the Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg inequalities that contains our operator. By the perturbative nature of the method, the solutions found in [11] are close to some radial solutions to the unperturbed problem. On the other hand,

---

Key words and phrases. Elliptic equations in $I\!\!R^N$, existence and multiplicity, critical Sobolev exponent, Hardy inequality

2000*Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35D05, 35D10, 35J20, 35J25, 35J70, 46E30, 46E35.

First and third authors supported by project BFM2001-0183, M.C.Y.T. Spain. Second author supported by Italy MIUR, national project "Variational Methods and Nonlinear Differential Equations".

in [16] Smets obtains the existence of a positive solution for problem (1) with $h = 0$, k bounded, $k(0) = \lim_{|x|\to\infty} k(x)$ and dimension $N = 4$.
In this paper we study the existence of positive solutions in the case in which either $h \equiv 0$ and $k \not\equiv 1$ or $k \equiv 1$ and $h \not\equiv 0$ satisfying suitable assumptions. Our results hold in any dimension and are proved using the *concentration-compactness* arguments by P.L. Lions.
It is known that the general problem has an obstruction provided by a Pohozaev type identity that shows us the particularity of this problem, that is: *the existence of a positive solution depends not only on the size of the functions h and k but also on their shape.* More precisely, assume that u is a variational solution to our equation with $h, k \in \mathcal{C}^1$. Multiplying the equation by $\langle x, \nabla u\rangle$ and with a convenient argument of approximation we get that necessarily

$$\frac{\lambda}{2}\int \langle \nabla h(x), x\rangle \frac{u^2}{|x|^2}dx + \frac{1}{2^*}\int \langle \nabla k(x), x\rangle |u|^{2^*}dx = 0.$$

This behaviour makes the problem more interesting to be analyzed. The existence part of the paper is mainly based on the *concentration-compactness arguments* by P.L. Lions (see [13] and [14]) and involves some qualitative properties of the coefficients that avoids the Pohozaev type obstruction. We also obtain multiplicity of positive solutions by using variational and topological arguments.

The organization of the paper is as follows. Section 2 is devoted to the study of nonexistence and existence for $k \equiv 1$ and h satisfying suitable conditions. As pointed out above, we mainly use the *concentration-compactness* principle by P.L. Lions. The main result in this part is Theorem 2.5. Section 3 deals with the existence and multiplicity results for the case in which $h \equiv 0$ and k satisfies some convenient conditions. In this part of the paper we will use techniques that previously had been introduced to study related problems by Tarantello in [17] and refined by Cao- Chabrowsky in [6] (see also the references therein).We use this approach in the case that the function k achieves its maximum at a finite number of points. The main result in Section 3 is Theorem 3.13. In Section 4 we study a more general class of functions k, i.e. we treat the case in which k can reach its maximum at infinitely many points, but having only accumulation points at finite distance to the origin. To analyze this case we use the *Lusternik-Schnirelman category*. This point of view is inspired by the study of multiplicity of positive solutions to subcritical problems done by R. Musina in [15]. After several technical lemmas the main result contained in Section 4 is Theorem 4.5.

In a forthcoming paper we will discuss the case of critical equations related to the so called Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg inequalities.

Acknowledgment.- We want to thank Professor A. Ambrosetti for his encouragement and for many helpful suggestions. Part of this work was carried out while the second author was visiting Universidad Autónoma of Madrid; she wishes to express her gratitude to Departamento de Matemáticas of Universidad Autónoma for its warm hospitality.

2. PERTURBATION IN THE LINEAR TERM

We will study perturbations of a class of elliptic equations in $\mathbb{R}^N$ related to a Hardy inequality interacting with a nonlinear term involving the critical Sobolev exponent . Precisely we will consider the following problem

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} -\Delta u = \dfrac{A+h(x)}{|x|^2} u + u^{2^*-1}, \ x \in I\!\!R^N, \\ u > 0 \text{ in } I\!\!R^N, \text{ and } u \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!\!R^N), \end{array} \right. \tag{2}$$

where $N \geq 3$ and $2^* = \frac{2N}{N-2}$. Hypotheses on h will be given below. To be precise we recall the Hardy inequality.

Lemma 2.1. *(Hardy inequality) Assume that* $u \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!\!R^N)$, *then* $\dfrac{u}{|x|} \in L^2(I\!\!R^N)$ *and*

$$\int_{I\!\!R^N} \frac{|u|^2}{|x|^2} dx \leq C_N \int_{I\!\!R^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx,$$

where $C_N = \left(\frac{2}{N-2}\right)^2$ *is optimal and not attained.*

Hereafter we will call $\Lambda_N := C_N^{-1} = \frac{(N-2)^2}{4}$. See for instance [9] for a proof.
The case $h = 0$ of (2) has been studied by S. Terracini in [18]; she shows, in particular, that

1. if $A \geq \Lambda_N$, then problem (2) has no positive solution in $\mathcal{D}'(I\!\!R^N)$;
2. if $A \in (0, \Lambda_N)$ then problem (2) has the one-dimensional $\mathcal{C}^2$ manifold of positive solutions

$$Z_A = \left\{ w_\mu \mid w_\mu(x) = \mu^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} w^{(A)}\Big(\frac{x}{\mu}\Big), \ \mu > 0 \right\}, \tag{3}$$

where

$$w^{(A)}(x) = \frac{\left(N(N-2)\nu_A^2\right)^{\frac{N-2}{4}}}{\left(|x|^{1-\nu_A}(1+|x|^{2\nu_A})\right)^{\frac{N-2}{2}}}, \text{ and } \nu_A = \left(1 - \frac{A}{\Lambda_N}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{4}$$

Moreover, if we set $Q_A(u) = \displaystyle\int_{I\!\!R^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx - A \int_{I\!\!R^N} \frac{u^2}{|x|^2} dx$, then we obtain that

$$\overline{S} \equiv \inf_{u \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!\!R^N)\setminus\{0\}} \frac{Q_A(u)}{\|u\|_{2^*}^2} = \frac{Q_A(w_\mu)}{\|w_\mu\|_{2^*}^2} = S\Big(1 - \frac{A}{\Lambda_N}\Big)^{\frac{N-1}{N}}, \tag{5}$$

where S is the best constant in the Sobolev inequality. Notice that $\overline{S}$ is attained exactly in the family w_μ defined in (3).

2.1. Nonexistence results.

We begin by proving some nonexistence results that show the fact that in this kind of problems both the size and the shape of the perturbation are important. Define

$$Q(u) = \int_{I\!\!R^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx - \int_{I\!\!R^N} \left(\frac{A+h(x)}{|x|^2}\right) u^2 dx, \tag{6}$$

$\mathcal{K} = \left\{ u \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!\!R^N) \mid \int_{I\!\!R^N} |u|^{2^*} dx = 1 \right\}$, and consider $I_1 = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{K}} Q(u)$.

Lemma 2.2. *Problem (2) has no positive solution in the following cases:*

(a) *If* $A + h(x) \geq 0$ *in some ball* $B_\delta(0)$ *and* $I_1 < 0$.
(b) *If* h *is a differentiable function such that* $\langle h'(x), x \rangle$ *has a fixed sign.*

Proof. We begin by proving nonexistence under hypothesis (a). Suppose that $I_1 < 0$, and let u be a positive solution to (2). By classical regularity results for elliptic equations we obtain that $u \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(I\!R^N \backslash \{0\})$. On the other hand, since $A + h(x) \geq 0$ in $B_\delta(0)$, we obtain that $-\Delta u \geq 0$ in $\mathcal{D}'(B_\delta(0))$. Therefore, since $u \geq 0$ and $u \neq 0$, by the strong maximum principle we obtain that $u(x) \geq c > 0$ in some ball $B_\eta(0) \subset\subset B_\delta(0)$.

Let $\phi_n \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(I\!R^N)$, $\phi_n \geq 0$, $||\phi_n||_{2*} = 1$, be a minimizing sequence of I_1. By using $\dfrac{\phi_n^2}{u}$ as a test function in equation (2) we obtain

$$\int_{I\!R^N} \nabla\Big(\frac{\phi_n^2}{u}\Big)\nabla u = \int_{I\!R^N} \frac{A+h(x)}{|x|^2}\phi_n^2 + \int_{I\!R^N} \phi_n^2 u^{2^*-2}.$$

A direct computation gives

$$2\int_{I\!R^N} \frac{\phi_n}{u}\nabla\phi_n \nabla u dx - \int_{I\!R^N} \frac{\phi_n^2}{u^2}|\nabla u|^2 dx = \int_{I\!R^N} \frac{A+h(x)}{|x|^2}\phi_n^2 + \int_{I\!R^N} \phi_n^2 u^{2^*-2}, \tag{7}$$

and since

$$2\frac{\phi_n}{u}\nabla\phi_n\nabla u - \frac{\phi_n^2}{u^2}|\nabla u|^2 \leq |\nabla\phi_n|^2,$$

we conclude that

$$\int_{I\!R^N} |\nabla\phi_n|^2 dx \geq \int_{I\!R^N} \frac{A+h(x)}{|x|^2}\phi_n^2 + \int_{I\!R^N} \phi_n^2 u^{2^*-2}.$$

On the other hand, $I_1 < 0$ implies that we can find an integer n_0 such that if $n \geq n_0$,

$$\int_{I\!R^N} |\nabla\phi_n|^2 - \int_{I\!R^N} \frac{A+h(x)}{|x|^2}\phi_n^2 < 0.$$

As a consequence $\int_{I\!R^N} \phi_n^2 u^{2^*-2} < 0$, for $n \geq n_0$, which contradicts the hypothesis $u > 0$.
Let us now prove (b). By using the Pohozaev multiplier $\langle x, \nabla u\rangle$, we obtain that if u is a positive solution to (2), then

$$\int_{I\!R^N} \frac{\langle h'(x), x\rangle}{|x|^2} u^2 dx = 0,$$

which is not possible if $\langle h'(x), x\rangle$ has a fixed sign and $u \not\equiv 0$. ■

Corollary 2.3. *Assume either*

- *i)* $A > \Lambda_N$ *and* $h \geq 0$*, or*
- *ii)* $A > \Lambda_N$ *and* $1 \leq \frac{4A}{(N-2)^2\|h\|_\infty}$,

then problem (2), has no positive solution.

2.2. **The local Palais-Smale condition: existence results.** To prove the existence results we will use a variational approach for the associated functional

$$J(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{I\!R^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx - \frac{1}{2}\int_{I\!R^N} \frac{A+h(x)}{|x|^2}u^2 dx - \frac{1}{2^*}\int_{I\!R^N} |u|^{2^*} dx. \tag{8}$$

We suppose that h verifies the following hypotheses

- (h0) $A + h(0) > 0$.
- (h1) $h \in C(I\!R^N) \cap L^\infty(I\!R^N)$.
- (h2) For some $c_0 > 0$, $A + ||h||_\infty \leq \Lambda_N - c_0$.

Critical points of J in $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!\!R^N)$ are solutions to equation (2). We begin by proving a local Palais-Smale condition for J. Precisely we prove the following Theorem.

Theorem 2.4. *Suppose that* $(h0)$, $(h1)$, $(h2)$ *hold and denote* $h(\infty) \equiv \limsup_{|x|\to\infty} h(x)$. *Let* $\{u_n\} \subset \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!\!R^N)$ *be a Palais-Smale sequence for* J, *namely*

$$J(u_n) \to c < \infty, \;\; J'(u_n) \to 0.$$

If

$$c < c^* = \frac{1}{N} S^{\frac{N}{2}} \min\left\{ \Big(1 - \frac{A + h(0)}{\Lambda_N}\Big)^{\frac{N-1}{2}}, \; \Big(1 - \frac{A + h(\infty)}{\Lambda_N}\Big)^{\frac{N-1}{2}} \right\},$$

then $\{u_n\}$ *has a converging subsequence.*

Proof. Let $\{u_n\}$ be a Palais-Smale sequence for J, then according to $(h2)$, $\{u_n\}$ is bounded in $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!\!R^N)$. Then, up to a subsequence, *i)* $u_n \rightharpoonup u_0$ in $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!\!R^N)$, *ii)* $u_n \to u_0$ a.e., and *iii)* $u_n \to u_0$ in L^α_{loc}, $\alpha \in [1, 2^*)$. Therefore, by using the *concentration compactness principle* by P. L. Lions, (see [13] and [14]), there exists a subsequence (still denoted by $\{u_n\}$) which satisfies

(1) $|\nabla u_n|^2 \rightharpoonup d\mu \geq |\nabla u_0|^2 + \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \mu_j \delta_{x_j} + \mu_0 \delta_0$,
(2) $|u_n|^{2^*} \rightharpoonup d\nu = |u_0|^{2^*} + \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}} \nu_j \delta_{x_j} + \nu_0 \delta_0$,
(3) $S\nu_j^{\frac{2}{2^*}} \leq \mu_j$ for all $j \in \mathcal{J} \cup \{0\}$, where $\mathcal{J}$ is at most countable,
(4) $\dfrac{u_n^2}{|x|^2} \rightharpoonup d\gamma = \dfrac{u_0^2}{|x|^2} + \gamma_0 \delta_0$,
(5) $\Lambda_N \gamma_0 \leq \mu_0$.

To study the concentration at infinity of the sequence we will also need to consider the following quantities

$$\nu_\infty = \lim_{R\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_{|x|>R} |u_n|^{2^*} dx, \quad \mu_\infty = \lim_{R\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_{|x|>R} |\nabla u_n|^{2^*} dx$$

and

$$\gamma_\infty = \lim_{R\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_{|x|>R} \frac{u_n^2}{|x|^2} dx.$$

We claim that $\mathcal{J}$ is finite and for $j \in \mathcal{J}$, either $\nu_j = 0$ or $\nu_j \geq S^{N/2}$. We follow closely the arguments in [3]. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and let ϕ be a smooth cut-off function centered at x_j, $0 \leq \phi(x) \leq 1$ such that

$$\phi(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } |x - x_j| \leq \dfrac{\varepsilon}{2}, \\ 0, & \text{if } |x - x_j| \geq \varepsilon, \end{cases}$$

and $|\nabla\phi| \leq \dfrac{4}{\varepsilon}$. So we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \langle J'(u_n), u_n\phi \rangle \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \left(\int_{I\!\!R^N} |\nabla u_n|^2 \phi + \int_{I\!\!R^N} u_n \nabla u_n \nabla \phi - \int_{I\!\!R^N} \frac{A + h(x)}{|x|^2} u_n^2 \phi - \int_{I\!\!R^N} \phi |u_n|^{2^*} \right). \end{aligned}$$

From 1), 2) and 4) and since $0 \notin \operatorname{supp}(\phi)$ we find that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{I\!R^N}|\nabla u_n|^2\phi=\int_{I\!R^N}\phi d\mu,\ \ \lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{I\!R^N}|u_n|^{2^*}\phi=\int_{I\!R^N}\phi d\nu$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{B_\varepsilon(x_j)}\frac{A+h(x)}{|x|^2}u_n^2\phi=\int_{B_\varepsilon(x_j)}\frac{A+h(x)}{|x|^2}u_0^2\phi.$$

Taking limits as $\varepsilon\to 0$ we obtain,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\left|\int_{I\!R^N}u_n\nabla u_n\nabla\phi\right|\to 0.$$

Hence,

$$0=\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\langle J'(u_n),u_n\phi\rangle=\mu_j-\nu_j.$$

By 3) we have that $S\nu_j^{\frac{2}{2^*}}\le\mu_j$, then we obtain that either $\nu_j=0$ or $\nu_j\ge S^{N/2}$, which implies that $\mathcal{J}$ is finite. The claim is proved.

Let us now study the possibility of concentration at $x=0$ and at ∞. Let ψ be a regular function such that $0\le\psi(x)\le 1$,

$$\psi(x)=\begin{cases}1, & \text{if } |x|>R+1\\ 0, & \text{if } |x|<R,\end{cases}$$

and $|\nabla\psi|\le\dfrac{4}{R}$. From (5) we obtain that

$$\frac{\displaystyle\int_{I\!R^N}|\nabla(u_n\psi)|^2dx-(A+h(\infty))\int_{I\!R^N}\frac{\psi^2u_n^2}{|x|^2}dx}{\left(\int_{I\!R^N}|\psi u_n|^{2^*}\right)^{2/2^*}}\ge S\Big(1-\frac{A+h(\infty)}{\Lambda_N}\Big)^{\frac{N-1}{N}}. \tag{9}$$

Hence

$$\int_{I\!R^N}|\nabla(u_n\psi)|^2dx-(A+h(\infty))\int_{I\!R^N}\frac{\psi^2u_n^2}{|x|^2}dx\ge S\Big(1-\frac{A+h(\infty)}{\Lambda_N}\Big)^{\frac{N-1}{N}}\Big(\int_{I\!R^N}|\psi u_n|^{2^*}\Big)^{2/2^*}.$$

Therefore we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{I\!R^N}\psi^2|\nabla u_n|^2dx+\int_{I\!R^N}u_n^2|\nabla\psi|^2dx+2\int_{I\!R^N}u_n\psi\nabla u_n\nabla\psi dx\\ &\ge(A+h(\infty))\textstyle\int_{I\!R^N}\dfrac{\psi^2u_n^2}{|x|^2}dx+S\Big(1-\dfrac{A+h(\infty)}{\Lambda_N}\Big)^{\frac{N-1}{N}}\Big(\textstyle\int_{I\!R^N}|\psi u_n|^{2^*}\Big)^{2/2^*}.\end{aligned}$$

We claim that

$$\lim_{R\to\infty}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\left\{\int_{I\!R^N}u_n^2|\nabla\psi|^2dx+2\int_{I\!R^N}|u_n|\psi|\nabla u_n||\nabla\psi|dx\right\}=0.$$

Using Hölder inequality we obtain

$$\int_{I\!R^N}|u_n|\psi|\nabla u_n||\nabla\psi|dx\ \ \le\ \ \Big(\int_{R<|x|<R+1}|u_n|^2|\nabla\psi|^2dx\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\int_{R<|x|<R+1}|\nabla u_n|^2dx\Big)^{1/2}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{I\!R^N}|u_n||\psi|\nabla u_n||\nabla\psi|dx &\le C\Big(\int_{R<|x|<R+1}|u_0|^2|\nabla\psi|^2dx\Big)^{1/2}\\ &\le C\Big(\int_{R<|x|<R+1}|u_0|^{2^*}dx\Big)^{2/2^*}\Big(\int_{R<|x|<R+1}|\nabla\psi|^Ndx\Big)^{2/N}\\ &\le \overline{C}\Big(\int_{R<|x|<R+1}|u_0|^{2^*}dx\Big)^{2/2^*}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we conclude that

$$\lim_{R\to\infty}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\int_{I\!R^N}|u_n||\psi|\nabla u_n||\nabla\psi|dx\le\overline{C}\lim_{R\to\infty}\Big(\int_{R<|x|<R+1}|u_0|^{2^*}dx\Big)^{2/2^*}=0.$$

Using the same argument we can prove that

$$\lim_{R\to\infty}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\int_{I\!R^N}u_n^2|\nabla\psi|^2=0.$$

Then we get

$$\mu_\infty-(A+h(\infty))\gamma_\infty\ge S\Big(1-\frac{A+h(\infty)}{\Lambda_N}\Big)^{\frac{N-1}{N}}\nu_\infty^{2/2^*}. \tag{10}$$

Since $\lim\limits_{R\to\infty}\lim\limits_{n\to\infty}\langle J'(u_n),u_n\psi\rangle=0$, we obtain that $\mu_\infty-(A+h(\infty))\gamma_\infty\le\nu_\infty$. Therefore we conclude that either $\nu_\infty=0$ or $\nu_\infty\ge S^{\frac{N}{2}}\big(1-\frac{A+h(\infty)}{\Lambda_N}\big)^{\frac{N-1}{2}}$.
The same holds for the concentration in $x_0=0$, namely that either

$$\nu_0=0 \text{ or } \nu_0\ge S^{\frac{N}{2}}\Big(1-\frac{A+h(0)}{\Lambda_N}\Big)^{\frac{N-1}{2}}.$$

As a conclusion we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}c &= J(u_n)-\frac12\langle J'(u_n),u_n\rangle+o(1)\\ &= \frac1N\int_{I\!R^N}|u_n|^{2*}dx+o(1)=\frac1N\Big\{\int_{I\!R^N}|u_0|^{2*}dx+\nu_0+\nu_\infty+\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}}\nu_j\Big\}.\end{aligned}$$

If we assume the existence of $j\in\mathcal{J}\cup\{0,\infty\}$ such that $\nu_j\ne0$, then we obtain that $c\ge c^*$ a contradiction with the hypothesis, then up to a subsequence $u_n\to u_0$ in $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!R^N)$. ∎

To find solutions requires to consider some path in $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!R^N)$ along which the maximum of $J(\gamma(t))$ is less than c^*. To do that, for $H=\max\{h(0),h(\infty)\}$, we consider $\{w_\mu\}$ the one parameter family of minimizer to problem (5) where A is replaced by $A+H$. Then we have the following result.

Theorem 2.5. *Suppose that (h0), (h1) and (h2) hold. Assume the existence of $\mu_0>0$ such that*

$$\int_{I\!R^N}h(x)\frac{w_{\mu_0}^2(x)}{|x|^2}dx>H\int_{I\!R^N}\frac{w_{\mu_0}^2(x)}{|x|^2}dx, \tag{11}$$

then (2) has at least a positive solution.

PROOF. Let μ_0 be as in the hypothesis, then if we set

$$f(t) = J(tw_{\mu_0}) = \frac{t^2}{2}\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla w_{\mu_0}|^2 dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{A+h(x)}{|x|^2} w_{\mu_0}^2 dx\Big) - \frac{t^{2^*}}{2^*}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w_{\mu_0}|^{2^*} dx, \; t \geq 0$$

we can see easily that f achieves its maximum at some $t_0 > 0$ and we can prove the existence of $\rho > 0$ such that $J(tw_{\mu_0}) < 0$ if $||tw_{\mu_0}|| \geq \rho$. By a simple calculation we obtain that

$$t_0^{2^*-2} = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla w_{\mu_0}|^2 dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{A+h(x)}{|x|^2} w_{\mu_0}^2 dx}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w_{\mu_0}|^{2^*} dx},$$

and

$$J(t_0 w_{\mu_0}) = \max_{t\geq 0} J(tw_{\mu_0}) = \frac{1}{N}\left(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla w_{\mu_0}|^2 dx - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{A+h(x)}{|x|^2} w_{\mu_0}^2 dx}{\big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w_{\mu_0}|^{2^*} dx\big)^{2/2^*}}\right)^{N/2}. \tag{12}$$

Using (11) we obtain that

$$J(t_0 w_{\mu_0}) < \frac{1}{N}\left(\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla w_{\mu_0}|^2 dx - (A+H)\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{w_{\mu_0}^2}{|x|^2} dx}{\big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |w_{\mu_0}|^{2^*} dx\big)^{2/2^*}}\right)^{N/2} = \frac{1}{N} S^{\frac{N}{2}}\Big(1 - \frac{A+H}{\Lambda_N}\Big)^{\frac{N-1}{2}} \leq c^*. \tag{13}$$

We set

$$\Gamma = \{\gamma \in C([0,1], \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N)) : \; \gamma(0) = 0 \text{ and } J(\gamma(1)) < 0\}.$$

Let

$$c = \inf_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \max_{t\in[0,1]} J(\gamma(t)).$$

Since $J(t_0 w_{\mu_0}) < c^*$, then we get a mountain pass critical point u_0. Then we have just to prove that we can choose $u_0 \geq 0$. We give two different proofs.

First proof. Consider the Nehari manifold,

$$\begin{aligned} M &\equiv \{u \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) : \; u \neq 0 \text{ and } \langle J'(u), u\rangle = 0\} \\ &= \Big\{u \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^N) : \; u \neq 0 \text{ and } \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 dx = \int_\Omega \frac{A+h(x)}{|x|^2} u^2 dx + \int_\Omega |u|^{2^*} dx\Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $u_0, \; |u_0| \in M$. Since u_0 is a mountain pass solution to problem (2) then one can prove easily that $c \equiv J(u_0) = \min\limits_{u\in M} J(u)$ (see [19]). Moreover as $J(|u_0|) = \min\limits_{u\in M} J(u)$, then $|u_0|$ is also a critical point of J.

Second proof. Here we use a variation of the deformation lemma. Since u_0 is a mountain pass critical point of J, which is even, we have

$$c = J(u_0) = J(|u_0|) = \max_{t>0} J(t|u_0|).$$

Let $t_1 > 0$ be such that $J(t_1|u_0|) < 0$. We set $\gamma_0(t) = t(t_1|u_0|)$ for $t \in [0,1]$. Notice that $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma$ and

$$c = J(|u_0|) = \max_{t\in[0,1]} J(\gamma_0(t)).$$

If $|u_0|$ is a critical point to J, then we have done. If not then using Lemma 3.7 of [10] we obtain that γ_0 can be deformed to a path $\gamma_1 \in \Gamma$ with $\max_{t\in[0,1]} J(\gamma_1(t)) < c$, a contradiction with the definition of c as a *min-max value*.
Hence we have nonnegative solution to problem (2). The positivity of the solution u_0 is an application of the strong maximum principle by using hypotheses $(h0)$ and $(h1)$. ■

We give now some sufficient condition on h to have hypothesis (11).

Lemma 2.6. *Suppose one of the following hypotheses holds*

1. $h(x) \geq h(0) + c_1|x|^{\nu_{A+H}(N-2)}$ *for* $|x|$ *small and* $c_1 > 0$ *if* $h(0) \geq h(\infty)$, *or*
2. $h(x) \geq h(\infty) + c_2|x|^{-\nu_{A+H}(N-2)}$ *for* $|x|$ *large and* $c_2 > 0$ *if* $h(\infty) \geq h(0)$,

then there exists $\mu_0 > 0$ *such that (11) holds.*

Proof. Let $\delta > 0$ be small such that if $|x| < \delta$ then $h(x) \geq h(0) + c_1|x|^{\nu_{A+H}(N-2)}$. For simplicity of notation we set $\nu_{A+H} = \nu$. Let

$$I_{\delta,\mu} = \int_{|x|<\delta} (h(x) - H) \frac{dx}{|x|^{(1-\nu)N+2\nu}(\mu^{2\nu} + |x|^{2\nu})^{N-2}},$$

then

$$I_{\delta,\mu} \geq c_1 \int_{|x|<\delta} \frac{|x|^{\nu(N-2)}dx}{|x|^{(1-\nu)N+2\nu}(\mu^{2\nu} + |x|^{2\nu})^{N-2}}.$$

Since $\nu(N-2) - [(1-\nu)N + 2\nu + 2\nu(N-2)] = -N$, we conclude that $I_{\delta,\mu} \to \infty$ as $\mu \to 0$. On the other hand

$$\int_{|x|\geq\delta} |h(x) - H| \frac{dx}{|x|^{(1-\nu)N+2\nu}(\mu^{2\nu} + |x|^{2\nu})^{N-2}} \leq C \int_{|x|\geq\delta} \frac{dx}{|x|^{(1+\nu)N-2\nu}} \leq C(\delta).$$

Therefore we get the existence of $\mu_0 > 0$ such that

$$\int_{I\!R^N} (h(x) - H)\frac{w^2_{\mu_0}(x)}{|x|^2}dx \geq \int_{|x|<\delta} (h(x) - H)\frac{w^2_{\mu_0}(x)}{|x|^2}dx - \int_{|x|\geq\delta} |h(x) - H|\frac{w^2_{\mu_0}(x)}{|x|^2}dx > 0.$$

Then the result follows.
The second case follows by using the same argument near infinity. ■

3. Perturbation of the nonlinear term: Multiplicity of positive solutions

In this section we deal with the following problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \dfrac{\lambda}{|x|^2}u + k(x)u^{2^*-1}, \ x \in I\!R^N, \\ u > 0 \text{ in } I\!R^N, \ \text{and } u \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!R^N), \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

where $N \geq 3, \ 0 < \lambda < \Lambda_N$ and k is a positive function.

3.1. **Existence.** Assume that k verifies the hypothesis

$$(K0) \quad k \in L^\infty(I\!R^N) \cap C(I\!R^N) \text{ and } ||k||_\infty > \max\{k(0), k(\infty)\}, \text{ where } k(\infty) \equiv \limsup_{|x|\to\infty} k(x).$$

We associate to problem (14) the following functional

$$J_\lambda(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{I\!R^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx - \frac{\lambda}{2}\int_{I\!R^N} \frac{u^2}{|x|^2} dx - \frac{1}{2^*}\int_{I\!R^N} k(x)|u|^{2^*} dx. \tag{15}$$

As in the first section we have the following Lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\{u_n\} \subset \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!R^N)$ be a Palais-Smale sequence for J_λ, namely*

$$J_\lambda(u_n) \to c < \infty, \; J'_\lambda(u_n) \to 0.$$

If

$$c < \tilde{c}(\lambda) = \frac{1}{N} S^{\frac{N}{2}} \min\left\{ ||k||_\infty^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}, \, (k(0))^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}\left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda_N}\right)^{\frac{N-1}{2}}, (k(\infty))^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}\left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda_N}\right)^{\frac{N-1}{2}} \right\}$$

then $\{u_n\}$ has a converging subsequence.

The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 2.4.
In the case in which k is a radial positive function, we can prove the following improved Palais-Smale condition.

Lemma 3.2. *Define*

$$\tilde{c}_1(\lambda) = \frac{1}{N} S^{\frac{N}{2}} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda_N}\right)^{\frac{N-1}{2}} \min\left\{(k(0))^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}, \, (k(\infty))^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}\right\}.$$

If $\{u_n\} \subset \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!R^N)$ is a Palais-Smale sequence for J_λ, namely

$$J_\lambda(u_n) \to c, \quad J'_\lambda(u_n) \to 0,$$

and $c < \tilde{c}_1$, then $\{u_n\}$ has a converging subsequence.

Remark 3.3. *This follows from the fact that the inclusion of $H^1_r(\Omega) \equiv \{u \in L^2(\Omega) : |\nabla u| \in L^2(\Omega), \, u$ radial$\}$, where $\Omega = \{x \in I\!R^N : R_1 < |x| < R_2\}$, in $L^q(\Omega)$ is compact for all $1 \le q < \infty$ and in particular for $q = 2^*$, see* [12].

As a consequence we obtain the following existence result.

Theorem 3.4. *Let k be a positive radial function such that $(K0)$ is satisfied. Assume that there exists $\mu_0 > 0$ such that*

$$\int_{I\!R^N} k(x) w_{\mu_0}^{2^*}(x) dx > \max\{k(0), k(\infty)\} \int_{I\!R^N} w_{\mu_0}^{2^*}(x) dx, \tag{16}$$

where w_{μ_0} is a solution to problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w = \dfrac{\lambda}{|x|^2} w + w^{2^*-1}, \; x \in I\!R^N, \\ w > 0 \text{ in } I\!R^N, \text{ and } w \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!R^N). \end{cases}$$

Then (14) has at least a positive solution.

Proof. Since the proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 2.5, we omit it. ■

Remark 3.5. *Assume that one of the following hypotheses holds*

(1) $k(x) \geq k(0) + c_1|x|^{2\nu_\lambda}$ *for* $|x|$ *small and* $c_1 > 0$ *if* $k(0) \geq k(\infty)$, *or*
(2) $k(x) \geq k(\infty) + c_2|x|^{-2\nu_\lambda}$ *for* $|x|$ *large and* $c_2 > 0$ *if* $k(\infty) \geq k(0)$,

then there exists $\mu_0 > 0$ *such that (16) holds.*

Let us set

$$b(\lambda) \equiv \begin{cases} +\infty & \text{if } k(0) = k(\infty) = 0 \\ \min\left\{ (k(0))^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} \left(1 - \dfrac{\lambda}{\Lambda_N}\right)^{\frac{N-1}{2}}, (k(\infty))^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} \left(1 - \dfrac{\lambda}{\Lambda_N}\right)^{\frac{N-1}{2}} \right\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 3.6. *If* $(K0)$ *holds, there exists* $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ *such that* $||k||_\infty^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} \leq b(\varepsilon_0)$ *and*

$$\tilde{c}(\lambda) = \tilde{c} \equiv \frac{1}{N} S^{N/2} ||k||_\infty^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} \tag{17}$$

for any $0 < \lambda \leq \varepsilon_0$.

Proof. ¿From $(K0)$ it follows that if ε_0 is sufficiently small then $||k||_\infty^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} \leq b(\varepsilon_0)$ and hence from the definition of $\tilde{c}(\lambda)$ we obtain the result. ■

3.2. **Multiplicity.** To find multiplicity results for problem (14) we need the following extra hypotheses on k:

- $(K1)$ the set $\mathcal{C}(k) = \left\{ a \in I\!R^N \,\middle|\, k(a) = \max\limits_{x \in I\!R^N} k(x) \right\}$ is finite, say $\mathcal{C}(k) = \left\{ a_j \,|\, 1 \leq j \leq \text{Card}\,(\mathcal{C}(k)) \right\}$;
- $(K2)$ there exists $2 < \theta < N$ such that if $a_j \in \mathcal{C}(k)$ then $k(a_j) - k(x) = o(|x - a_j|)^\theta$ as $x \to a_j$.

Consider $0 < r_0 \ll 1$ such that $B_{r_0}(a_j) \cap B_{r_0}(a_i) = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$, $1 \leq i, j \leq \text{Card}\,(\mathcal{C}(k))$. Let $\delta = \frac{r_0}{3}$ and for any $1 \leq j \leq \text{Card}\,(\mathcal{C}(k))$ define the following function

$$T_j(u) = \frac{\int_{I\!R^N} \psi_j(x)|\nabla u|^2 dx}{\int_{I\!R^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx} \quad \text{where} \quad \psi_j(x) = \min\{1, |x - a_j|\}. \tag{18}$$

Notice that if $u \not\equiv 0$ and $T_j(u) \leq \delta$, then

$$\begin{aligned} r_0 \int_{I\!R^N \setminus B_{r_0}(a_j)} |\nabla u|^2 dx &\leq \int_{I\!R^N \setminus B_{r_0}(a_j)} \psi_j(x)|\nabla u|^2 dx \\ &\leq \int_{I\!R^N} \psi_j(x)|\nabla u|^2 dx \leq \delta \int_{I\!R^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx = \frac{r_0}{3} \int_{I\!R^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have the following property.

Lemma 3.7. *Let* $u \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!R^N)$ *be such that* $T_j(u) \leq \delta$, *then*

$$\int_{I\!R^N} |\nabla u|^2 \geq 3 \int_{I\!R^N \setminus B_{r_0}(a_j)} |\nabla u|^2 dx.$$

As a consequence we obtain the following separation result.

Corollary 3.8. *Consider* $u \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!R^N)$, $u \not\equiv 0$, *such that* $T_i(u) \leq \delta$ *and* $T_j(u) \leq \delta$, *then* $i = j$.

PROOF. By Lemma 3.7 we obtain that

$$2\int_{I\!R^N}|\nabla u|^2dx \geq 3\Big(\int_{I\!R^N\setminus B_{r_0}(a_i)}|\nabla u|^2dx+\int_{I\!R^N\setminus B_{r_0}(a_j)}|\nabla u|^2dx\Big).$$

If $i\neq j$ we find that

$$2\int_{I\!R^N}|\nabla u|^2dx \geq 3\int_{I\!R^N}|\nabla u|^2dx,$$

a contradiction if $u\not\equiv 0$. ■

Consider the Nehari manifold,

$$M(\lambda)=\{u\in\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!R^N):\ u\not\equiv 0 \text{ and } \langle J_\lambda'(u),u\rangle=0\}. \tag{19}$$

Therefore if $u\in M(\lambda)$

$$\int_{I\!R^N}|\nabla u|^2dx-\lambda\int_{I\!R^N}\frac{u^2}{|x|^2}dx=\int_{I\!R^N}k(x)|u|^{2^*}dx.$$

Notice that for all $u\in\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!R^N)$, $u\not\equiv 0$, there exists $t>0$ such that $tu\in M(\lambda)$ and for all $u\in M(\lambda)$ we have

$$\int_{I\!R^N}|\nabla u|^2dx-\lambda\int_{I\!R^N}\frac{u^2}{|x|^2}dx<(2^*-1)\int_{I\!R^N}k(x)|u|^{2^*}dx,$$

hence, there exists $c_1>0$ such that

$$\forall u\in M(\lambda),\quad ||u||_{\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!R^N)}\geq c_1.$$

Definition 3.9. *For any* $0<\lambda<\Lambda_N$ *and* $1\leq j\leq \mathrm{Card}\,(\mathcal{C}(k))$*, let us consider*

$$M_j(\lambda)=\{u\in M(\lambda):\ T_j(u)<\delta\} \textit{ and its boundary } \Gamma_j(\lambda)=\{u\in M(\lambda):\ T_j(u)=\delta\}.$$

We define

$$m_j(\lambda)=\inf\{J_\lambda(u):\ u\in M_j(\lambda)\} \textit{ and } \eta_j(\lambda)=\inf\{J_\lambda(u):\ u\in\Gamma_j(\lambda)\}.$$

The following two Lemmas give the behaviour of the functional with respect to the critical level $\tilde{c}$.

Lemma 3.10. *Suppose that* $(K0)$, $(K1)$, *and* $(K2)$ *hold, then* $M_j(\lambda)\neq\emptyset$ *and there exists* $\varepsilon_1>0$ *such that*

$$m_j(\lambda)<\tilde{c}\quad \textit{for all } 0<\lambda\leq\varepsilon_1 \textit{ and } 1\leq j\leq\mathrm{Card}\,(\mathcal{C}(k)). \tag{20}$$

PROOF. We set

$$v_{\mu,j}(x)=\frac{1}{(\mu^2+|x-a_j|^2)^{\frac{N-2}{2}}}\quad\text{and}\quad u_{\mu,j}=\frac{v_{\mu,j}}{||v_{\mu,j}||_{2^*}}, \tag{21}$$

then $||u_{\mu,j}||_{2^*}=1$ and $\int_{I\!R^N}|\nabla u_{\mu,j}|^2dx=S$. If

$$t_{\mu,j}(\lambda)=\left(\frac{\int_{I\!R^N}|\nabla u_{\mu,j}|^2dx-\lambda\int_{I\!R^N}|x|^{-2}u_{\mu,j}^2dx}{\int_{I\!R^N}k(x)|u_{\mu,j}|^{2^*}dx}\right)^{\frac{N-2}{4}},$$

then $t_{\mu,j}(\lambda)u_{\mu,j} \in M(\lambda)$. Making the change of variable $x - a_j = \mu y$, we obtain

$$T_j(t_{\mu,j}(\lambda)u_{\mu,j}) = \frac{\int_{I\!R^N} \psi_j(x)|\nabla u_{\mu,j}|^2 dx}{\int_{I\!R^N} |\nabla u_{\mu,j}|^2 dx} = \frac{\int_{I\!R^N} \psi_j(a_j + \mu y)|\nabla u_0(y)|^2 dy}{\int_{I\!R^N} |\nabla u_0(y)|^2 dy},$$

where $u_0(x)$ is $u_{\mu,j}$ to scale $\mu = 1$ and concentrated in the origin. Then

$$\lim_{\mu\to 0} T_j(t_{\mu,j}(\lambda)u_{\mu,j}) = \frac{\int_{I\!R^N} \psi_j(a_j)|\nabla u_0(y)|^2 dy}{\int_{I\!R^N} |\nabla u_0(y)|^2 dy} = \psi_j(a_j) = 0,$$

uniformly in λ. Hence we get the existence of μ_0 independent of λ such that if $\mu < \mu_0$, then $t_{\mu,j}(\lambda)u_{\mu,j} \in M_j(\lambda)$. Notice that

$$t_{\mu,j}(\lambda) \geq t_1(\lambda) \equiv \left(\|k\|_\infty^{-1} \Big(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda_N}\Big) S \right)^{\frac{N-2}{4}}.$$

In order to prove (20), it is sufficient to show the existence of $\mu < \mu_0$ such that if $0 < \lambda < \varepsilon_1$ then

$$\max_{t\geq t_1(\lambda)} J_\lambda(t u_{\mu,j}) = J_\lambda(t_{\mu,j}(\lambda)u_{\mu,j}) < \tilde{c}.$$

We have

$$\max_{t\geq t_1(\lambda)} J_\lambda(t u_{\mu,j}) \leq \max_{t>0} \Big\{ \frac{t^2}{2} \int_{I\!R^N} |\nabla u_{\mu,j}|^2 dx - \frac{t^{2^*}}{2^*} \int_{I\!R^N} k(x)|u_{\mu,j}|^{2^*} dx \Big\} - \frac{1}{2}\lambda t_1^2(\lambda) \int_{I\!R^N} \frac{u_{\mu,j}^2}{|x|^2} dx$$

and

$$\max_{t>0} \Big\{ \frac{t^2}{2} \int_{I\!R^N} |\nabla u_{\mu,j}|^2 dx - \frac{t^{2^*}}{2^*} \int_{I\!R^N} k(x)|u_{\mu,j}|^{2^*} dx \Big\} = \frac{1}{N} \Bigg(\frac{S}{\big(\int_{I\!R^N} k(x)|u_{\mu,j}|^{2^*} dx\big)^{2/2^*}} \Bigg)^{N/2}.$$

In view of assumption $(K2)$ we have that for some positive constants $\bar{c}_1, \bar{c}_2$

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{I\!R^N} k(x)|u_{\mu,j}|^{2^*} dx &= ||k||_\infty - \int_{I\!R^N} (k(a_j) - k(x))|u_{\mu,j}|^{2^*} dx \\
&= ||k||_\infty - \bar{c}_1 \mu^N \int_{I\!R^N} \frac{k(a_j) - k(x)}{(\mu^2 + |x - a_j|^2)^N} dx \\
&\geq ||k||_\infty - \bar{c}_1 \mu^N \Big\{ \int_{B_\delta(a_j)} \frac{\bar{c}_2 |x - a_j|^\theta dx}{(\mu^2 + |x - a_j|^2)^N} + 2\|k\|_\infty \int_{I\!R^N \setminus B_\delta(a_j)} \frac{dx}{(\mu^2 + |x - a_j|^2)^N} \Big\} \\
&\geq ||k||_\infty - \bar{c}_1 \mu^N \Big\{ \mu^{\theta - N} \bar{c}_2 \int_{I\!R^N} \frac{|y|^\theta dy}{(1 + |y|^2)^N} + 2\|k\|_\infty \int_{|y|\geq\delta} \frac{dy}{|y|^{2N}} \Big\} \\
&= ||k||_\infty + O(\mu^\theta).
\end{aligned}$$

Then we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{t\geq t_1(\lambda)} J(t u_{\mu,j}) &\leq \frac{1}{N} \frac{S^{N/2}}{||k||_\infty^{\frac{N-2}{2}} + O(\mu^\theta)} - \frac{1}{2}\lambda t_1^2(\lambda) \int_{I\!R^N} \frac{u_{\mu,j}^2}{|x|^2} dx \\
&\leq \frac{1}{N} \frac{S^{N/2}}{||k||_\infty^{\frac{N-2}{2}}} + O(\mu^\theta) - \frac{1}{2}\lambda t_1^2(\lambda) \int_{I\!R^N} \frac{u_{\mu,j}^2}{|x|^2} dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Using estimate A.6 from [16] we obtain that for some positive constant c

$$\int_{I\!R^N} \frac{u_{\mu,j}^2}{|x|^2}dx \geq c\mu^2 \text{ as } \mu \to 0.$$

Therefore we get

$$\begin{aligned}\max_{t\geq t_1(\lambda)} J(tu_{\mu,j}) &\leq \frac{1}{N}\frac{S^{N/2}}{||k||_\infty^{\frac{N-2}{2}}} + O(\mu^\theta) - \frac{1}{2}c\lambda t_1^2(\lambda)\mu^2 \\ &\leq \tilde{c} + \bar{c}_3\mu^\theta - \frac{1}{2}c\lambda t_1^2(\lambda)\mu^2,\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{c}_3$ is a positive constant. Since from $(K2)$ we have $2 < \theta < N$, we get the existence of ε_1 and μ_0 such that if $\mu < \mu_0$ and $0 < \lambda < \varepsilon_1$, then $\max\limits_{t\geq t_1(\lambda)} J(tu_{\mu,j}) < \tilde{c}$ and the result follows. ■

We prove now the next result.

Lemma 3.11. *Suppose that* $(K0)$, $(K1)$, *and* $(K2)$ *are satisfied, then there exists* ε_2 *such that for all* $0 < \lambda < \varepsilon_2$ *we have*

$$\tilde{c} < \eta_j(\lambda).$$

PROOF. We argue by contradiction. We assume the existence of $\lambda_n \to 0$ and $\{u_n\}$ such that $u_n \in \Gamma_j(\lambda_n)$ and $J_{\lambda_n}(u_n) \to c \leq \tilde{c} = \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2}||k||_\infty^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}$. We can easily prove that $\{u_n\}$ is bounded. Then up to a subsequence we get the existence of $l > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{I\!R^N} |\nabla u_n|^2 dx = \lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{I\!R^N} k(x)|u_n|^{2^*}dx = l.$$

Notice that $l \geq S^{N/2}||k||_\infty^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}$. On the other hand, by the definition of $\{u_n\}$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{N}l + o(1) &= J_{\lambda_n}(u_n) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\int_{I\!R^N} |\nabla u_n|^2 dx - \frac{\lambda_n}{2}\int_{I\!R^N}\frac{u_n^2}{|x|^2} - \frac{1}{2^*}\int_{I\!R^N} k(x)|u_n|^{2^*}dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N}S^{N/2}||k||_\infty^{-\frac{N-2}{2}} + o(1).\end{aligned}$$

Then we conclude that $l = S^{N/2}||k||_\infty^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}$ and therefore,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{I\!R^N}\big(||k||_\infty - k(x)\big)|u_n|^{2^*}dx = 0. \tag{22}$$

We set $w_n = \dfrac{u_n}{||u_n||_{2^*}}$, then $||w_n||_{2^*} = 1$ and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{I\!R^N}|\nabla w_n|^2 dx = S.$$

Hence by using the concentration compactness arguments by P.L. Lions (see also Proposition 5.1 and 5.2 in [18]), we get the existence of $w_0 \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!R^N)$ such that w_n converges to w_0 weakly in $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!R^N)$ (up to a subsequence) and one of the following alternatives holds

(1) $w_0 \not\equiv 0$ and $w_n \to w_0$ strongly in the $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!R^N)$.

(2) $w_0 \equiv 0$ and either
  i) $|\nabla w_n|^2 \rightharpoonup d\mu = S\delta_{x_0}$ and $|w_n|^{2^*} \to d\nu = \delta_{x_0}$
  or
  ii) $|\nabla w_n|^2 \rightharpoonup d\mu_\infty = S\delta_\infty$ and $|w_n|^{2^*} \rightharpoonup d\nu_\infty = \delta_\infty$.

The last case means that

$$\nu_\infty = \lim_{R\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_{|x|>R} |w_n|^{2^*} dx = 1 \text{ and } \mu_\infty = \lim_{R\to\infty} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_{|x|>R} |\nabla w_n|^{2^*} dx = S.$$

If the first alternative holds, from (22) we obtain that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{I\!\!R^N} \big(||k||_\infty - k(x)\big) w_n^{2^*} dx = \int_{I\!\!R^N} \big(||k||_\infty - k(x)\big) w_0^{2^*} dx = 0,$$

a contradiction with the fact that k is not a constant.
Assume that we have the alternative 2 i), then since $T_j(w_n) = T_j(u_n) = \delta$, we conclude that

$$\delta = T_j(w_n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\int_{I\!\!R^N} \psi_j(x)|\nabla w_n|^2 dx}{\int_{I\!\!R^N} |\nabla w_n|^2 dx} = \psi_j(x_0).$$

Hence the concentration is impossible in any point $a_j \in \mathcal{C}(k)$. On the other hand from (22) we obtain that

$$0 = \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{I\!\!R^N} \big(||k||_\infty - k(x)\big) w_n^{2^*} dx = ||k||_\infty - k(x_0),$$

a contradiction.
To analyze concentration at ∞, consider a regular function ξ satisfying

$$\xi(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } |x| > R+1 \\ 0, & \text{if } |x| < R, \end{cases}$$

where R is chosen in a such way that $|a_j| < R - 1$ for all j. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta = T_j(w_n) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\int_{I\!\!R^N} \psi_j(x)|\nabla w_n|^2 dx}{\int_{I\!\!R^N} |\nabla w_n|^2 dx} \\ &= \lim_{R\to\infty} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\int_{I\!\!R^N} \xi(x)|\nabla w_n|^2 dx + \int_{I\!\!R^N} (1-\xi(x))\psi_j(x)|\nabla w_n|^2 dx}{\int_{I\!\!R^N} |\nabla w_n|^2 dx}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \int_{I\!\!R^N} (1-\xi(x))\psi_j(x)|\nabla w_n|^2 dx = 0$, we conclude that

$$\delta = \lim_{R\to\infty} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\int_{I\!\!R^N} \xi(x)|\nabla w_n|^2 dx}{\int_{I\!\!R^N} |\nabla w_n|^2 dx} = 1,$$

a contradiction if we choose $\delta < 1$. So we conclude. ■

We need now the following Lemma that is suggested by the work of Tarantello [17]. See also [6].

Lemma 3.12. *Assume that* $0 < \lambda < \min\{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\}$ *where* ε_1, ε_2 *are given by Lemmas 3.10 and 3.11. Then for all* $u \in M_j(\lambda)$ *there exists* $\rho_u > 0$ *and a differentiable function*

$$f : B(0, \rho_u) \subset \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!\!R^N) \to I\!\!R$$

such that $f(0) = 1$ *and for all* $w \in B(0, \rho_u)$ *we have* $f(w)(u - w) \in M_j(\lambda)$. *Moreover for all* $v \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!\!R^N)$ *we have*

$$\langle f'(0), v\rangle = -\frac{2\int_{I\!\!R^N} \nabla u \nabla v dx - 2\lambda \int_{I\!\!R^N} \frac{uv}{|x|^2} dx - 2^* \int_{I\!\!R^N} k(x)|u|^{2^*-2} uv dx}{\int_{I\!\!R^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx - \lambda \int_{I\!\!R^N} \frac{u^2}{|x|^2} dx - (2^* - 1)\int_{I\!\!R^N} k(x)|u|^{2^*} dx}. \tag{23}$$

Proof. Let $u \in M_j(\lambda)$ and let $G : I\!\!R \times \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!\!R^N) \to I\!\!R$ be the function defined by

$$G(t, w) = t\Big(\int_{I\!\!R^N} |\nabla(u - w)|^2 dx - \lambda \int_{I\!\!R^N} \frac{(u - w)^2}{|x|^2} dx\Big) - t^{2^*-1} \int_{I\!\!R^N} k(x)|u - w|^{2^*} dx.$$

Then $G(1, 0) = 0$ and $G_t(1, 0) = \int_{I\!\!R^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx - \lambda \int_{I\!\!R^N} \frac{u^2}{|x|^2} dx - (2^* - 1) \int_{I\!\!R^N} k(x)|u|^{2^*} dx \neq 0$ (since $u \in M_j(\lambda)$). Then by using the Implicit Function Theorem we get the existence of $\rho_u > 0$ small enough and of a differentiable function f satisfying the required property. Moreover, notice that

$$\langle f'(0), v\rangle = -\frac{\langle G_w(1, 0), v\rangle}{G_t(1, 0)} = -\frac{2\int_{I\!\!R^N} \nabla u \nabla v dx - 2\lambda \int_{I\!\!R^N} \frac{uv}{|x|^2} dx - 2^* \int_{I\!\!R^N} k(x)|u|^{2^*-2} uv dx}{\int_{I\!\!R^N} |\nabla u|^2 dx - \lambda \int_{I\!\!R^N} \frac{u^2}{|x|^2} dx - (2^* - 1)\int_{I\!\!R^N} k(x)|u|^{2^*} dx}.$$

■

We are now in position to prove the main result.

Theorem 3.13. *Assume that* $(K0)$, $(K1)$, *and* $(K2)$ *hold, then there exists* ε_3 *small such that for all* $0 < \lambda < \varepsilon_3$ *equation (14) has* Card$(\mathcal{C}(k))$ *positive solutions* $u_{j,\lambda}$ *such that*

$$|\nabla u_{j,\lambda}|^2 \to S^{N/2}||k||_\infty^{-(N-2)/2}\delta_{a_j} \text{ and } |u_{j,\lambda}|^{2^*} \to S^{N/2}||k||_\infty^{-N/2}\delta_{a_j} \text{ as } \lambda \to 0. \tag{24}$$

Proof. Assume that $0 < \lambda < \varepsilon_3 = \min\{\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2\}$, where ε_0, ε_1 and ε_2 are given by Lemmas 3.6, 3.10 and 3.11. Let $\{u_n\}$ be a minimizing sequence to J_λ in $M_j(\lambda)$, that is, $u_n \in M_j(\lambda)$ and $J_\lambda(u_n) \to m_j(\lambda)$ as $n \to \infty$. Since $J_\lambda(u_n) = J_\lambda(|u_n|)$, we can choose $u_n \geq 0$. Notice that we can prove the existence of c_1, c_2 such that $c_1 \leq ||u_n||_{\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!\!R^N)} \leq c_2$. By the Ekeland variational principle we get the existence of a subsequence denoted also by $\{u_n\}$ such that

$$J_\lambda(u_n) \leq m_j(\lambda) + \frac{1}{n} \text{ and } J_\lambda(w) \geq J_\lambda(u_n) - \frac{1}{n}||w - u_n|| \text{ for all } w \in M_j(\lambda).$$

Let $0 < \rho < \rho_n \equiv \rho_{u_n}$ and $f_n \equiv f_{u_n}$, where ρ_{u_n} and f_{u_n} are given by Lemma 3.12. We set $v_\rho = \rho v$ where $||v||_{\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!\!R^N)} = 1$, then $v_\rho \in B(0, \rho_n)$ and we can apply Lemma 3.12 to obtain that $w_\rho = f_n(v_\rho)(u_n - v_\rho) \in M_j(\lambda)$.
Therefore we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n}||w_\rho - u_n|| &\geq J_\lambda(u_n) - J_\lambda(w_\rho) = \langle J'_\lambda(u_n), u_n - w_\rho\rangle + o(||u_n - w_\rho||) \\ &\geq \rho f_n(\rho v)\langle J'_\lambda(u_n), v\rangle + o(||u_n - w_\rho||). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we conclude that

$$\langle J'_\lambda(u_n), v\rangle \leq \frac{1}{n} \frac{||w_\rho - u_n||}{\rho f_n(\rho v)}(1 + o(1)) \text{ as } \rho \to 0.$$

Since $|f_n(\rho v)| \to |f_n(0)| \geq c$ as $\rho \to 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{||w_\rho - u_n||}{\rho} &= \frac{||f_n(0)u_n - f_n(\rho v)(u_n - \rho v)||}{\rho}\\ &\leq \frac{||u_n|||f_n(0) - f_n(\rho v)| + |\rho||f_n(\rho v)|}{\rho} \leq C|f_n'(0)|||v|| + c_3 \leq c.\end{aligned}$$

Then we conclude that $J_\lambda'(u_n) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Hence $\{u_n\}$ is a Palais-Smale sequence for J_λ. Since $m_j(\lambda) < \tilde{c}$ and $\tilde{c} = \tilde{c}(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \leq \varepsilon_0$, then from Lemma 3.1 we get the existence result.
To prove (24) we follow the proof of Lemma 3.11. Assume $\lambda_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ and let $u_n \equiv u_{j_0,\lambda_n} \in M_{j_0}(\lambda_n)$ be a solution to problem (14) with $\lambda = \lambda_n$. Then up to a subsequence we get the existence of $l_1 > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{I\!R^N} |\nabla u_n|^2 dx = \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{I\!R^N} k(x)|u_n|^{2^*} dx = l_1.$$

Therefore as in the proof of Lemma 3.11 we obtain that $l_1 = S^{N/2}||k||_\infty^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}$ and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{I\!R^N} (||k||_\infty - k(x))u_n^{2^*} dx = 0.$$

We set $w_n = \dfrac{u_n}{||u_n||_{2^*}}$, then $||w_n||_{2^*} = 1$ and $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} ||w_n||^2_{\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!R^N)} = S$. Hence we get the existence of $w_0 \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!R^N)$ such that one of the following alternatives holds

1. $w_0 \not\equiv 0$ and $w_n \to w_0$ strongly in the $\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!R^N)$.
2. $w_0 \equiv 0$ and either
   i) $|\nabla w_n|^2 \rightharpoonup d\mu = S\delta_{x_0}$ and $|w_n|^{2^*} \to d\nu = \delta_{x_0}$
   or
   ii) $|\nabla w_n|^2 \rightharpoonup d\mu_\infty = S\delta_\infty$ and $|w_n|^{2^*} \rightharpoonup d\nu_\infty = \delta_\infty$.

As in Lemma 3.11, the alternative 1 and the alternative 2 ii) do not hold. Then we conclude that the unique possible behaviour is the alternative 2. i), namely, we get the existence of $x_0 \in I\!R^N$ such that

$$|\nabla w_n|^2 \rightharpoonup d\mu = S\delta_{x_0} \text{ and } |w_n|^{2^*} \rightharpoonup d\nu = \delta_{x_0}.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{I\!R^N} |\nabla w_n|^2 dx &= S + o(1) = S\int_{I\!R^N} |w_n|^{2^*} dx + o(1) = \frac{S}{||k||_\infty} \int_{I\!R^N} k(x)|w_n|^{2^*} dx + o(1)\\ &= \frac{S}{||k||_\infty} k(x_0) + o(1),\end{aligned}$$

then we obtain that $x_0 \in \mathcal{C}(k)$. Using Corollary 3.8, we conclude that $x_0 = a_{j_0}$ and the result follows. ■

Remark 3.14. *As in* [4]*, we can prove the same kind of results under more general condition on* k*. For instance, we can assume that* k *changes sign and the following conditions hold,*

- $(K'1)$ $\max\limits_{x\in I\!R^N} k(x) > 0$ *and* $\mathcal{C}'(k) = \{a \in I\!R^N \mid k(a) = \max\limits_{x\in I\!R^N} k(x)\}$ *is a finite set.*
- $(K'2)$ $(K2)$ *holds.*

In this case the level at which the Palais-Smale conditions fails becomes

$$\hat{c}(\lambda)=\frac{1}{N}S^{\frac{N}{2}}\min\left\{||k_+||_\infty^{-\frac{N-2}{2}},\,(k_+(0))^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}\Big(1-\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda_N}\Big)^{\frac{N-1}{2}},(k_+(\infty))^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}\Big(1-\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda_N}\Big)^{\frac{N-1}{2}}\right\}.$$

4. CATEGORY SETTING.

In this section we use the Lusternik-Schnirelman category theory to get multiplicity results for problem (14), we refer to [1] for a complete discussion. We follow the argument by Musina in [15]. We assume that k is a nonnegative function and that $0<\lambda<\overline{\varepsilon}_0$ where $\overline{\varepsilon}_0$ is chosen in a such way that $\big(1-\frac{\overline{\varepsilon}_0}{\Lambda_N}\big)^{\frac{N-1}{2}}>\frac{1}{2}$ and $\overline{\varepsilon}_0\le\varepsilon_0$, being ε_0 given in Lemma 3.6. We set for $\delta>0$

$$\mathcal{C}(k)=\{a\in I\!\!R^N\mid k(a)=||k(x)||_\infty\}\text{ and }\mathcal{C}_\delta(k)=\{x\in I\!\!R^N: dist(x,\mathcal{C}(k))\le\delta\}.$$

We suppose that $(K2)$ holds and

$$(K3)\quad\text{there exist } R_0,\,d_0>0\text{ such that }\sup_{|x|>R_0}|k(x)|\le||k||_\infty-d_0.$$

Let $M(\lambda)$ be defined by (19). Consider

$$\tilde{M}(\lambda)\equiv\{u\in M(\lambda):\,J_\lambda(u)<\tilde{c}\}.$$

Then we have the following local Palais-Smale condition.

Lemma 4.1. *Let* $\{v_n\}\subset M(\lambda)$ *be such that*

$$J_\lambda(v_n)\to c<\tilde{c}\text{ and }J'_{\lambda|_{M(\lambda)}}(v_n)\to 0,\tag{25}$$

then $\{v_n\}$ *contains a converging subsequence.*

PROOF. Assume that $\{v_n\}$ satisfies (25), then there exists $\{\alpha_n\}\subset I\!\!R$ such that

$$J'_\lambda(v_n)-\alpha_nG'_\lambda(v_n)\to 0\text{ as }n\to\infty\text{ in }\mathcal{D}^{-1,2}(I\!\!R^N)\tag{26}$$

where $G_\lambda(u)=\langle J'_\lambda(u),u\rangle$. Since $\{v_n\}\subset M(\lambda)$ and $J_\lambda(v_n)\le\tilde{c}$, we have $r_1\le||v_n||_{\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!\!R^N)}\le r_2$ for some constants $r_1,r_2>0$. Using v_n as a test function in (26) we conclude that $\alpha_n\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$. Hence $\{v_n\}$ is a Palais-Smale sequence for J_λ at the level $c<\tilde{c}$ and then the result follows by using Lemma 3.1. ■

To prove that $\tilde{M}(\lambda)\neq\emptyset$ we give the next result.

Lemma 4.2. *There exists* $\overline{\varepsilon}_1>0$ *such that if* $0<\lambda<\lambda_0:=\min\{\overline{\varepsilon}_0,\overline{\varepsilon}_1\}$, *then* $\tilde{M}(\lambda)\neq\emptyset$. *Moreover for any* $\{\lambda_n\}\subset I\!\!R_+$ *such that* $\lambda_n\to 0$ *as* $n\to\infty$ *and* $\{v_n\}\subset\tilde{M}(\lambda_n)$, *there exist* $\{x_n\}\subset I\!\!R^N$ *and* $\{r_n\}\subset I\!\!R_+$ *such that* $x_n\to x_0\in\mathcal{C}(k), r_n\to 0$ *as* $n\to\infty$ *and*

$$v_n-\left(\frac{S}{||k||_\infty}\right)^{\frac{N-2}{4}}u_{r_n}(\cdot-x_n)\to 0\text{ in }\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!\!R^N),\tag{27}$$

where

$$u_r(x)=\frac{C_r}{(r^2+|x|^2)^{\frac{N-2}{2}}}\tag{28}$$

and C_r *is the normalizing constant to be* $||u_r||_{2^*}=1$.

Proof. The first assertion follows by using the same argument as in Lemma 3.10 since we have

$$\max_{t>0} J_\lambda(tw_{\mu,x}) \le \frac{1}{N}\frac{S^{N/2}}{||k||_\infty^{\frac{N-2}{2}}} + O(\mu^\theta) - c\lambda\mu^2 < \tilde{c} \text{ for } \mu \text{ small and } 2<\theta<N,$$

where $w_{\mu,x}(y) = \dfrac{C}{(\mu^2+|y-x|^2)^{\frac{N-2}{2}}}$, $x \in \mathcal{C}(k)$ and C is the normalizing constant such that $||w_{\mu,x}||_{2^*} = 1$ (see also [5]). As a consequence, there exists λ_0 such that for all $0<\lambda<\lambda_0$ the set $\tilde{M}(\lambda)$ is not empty. To prove the second part of the Lemma, eventually passing to a subsequence we set

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{I\!R^N} |\nabla v_n|^2 dx = \lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{I\!R^N} k(x)|v_n|^{2^*} dx = l.$$

Then as in Lemma 3.11 we can prove that $l = S^{N/2}||k||_\infty^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}$ and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{I\!R^N} (||k||_\infty - k(x))v_n^{2^*} dx = 0. \tag{29}$$

Consider the normalized function $w_n = \dfrac{v_n}{||v_n||_{2^*}}$ and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int_{I\!R^N} |\nabla w_n|^2 dx = S.$$

Using the concentration-compactness arguments by P.L. Lions, we obtain the existence of $\{x_n\} \subset I\!R^N$ and $\{r_n\} \subset I\!R_+$ such that

$$w_n - u_{r_n}(\cdot - x_n) \to 0 \text{ in } \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!R^N), \tag{30}$$

and $w_n \rightharpoonup w_0 \in \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!R^N)$. Moreover by the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.11 the weak limit is $w_0 = 0$. We will show now that the concentration at infinity is not possible. Indeed if concentration at ∞ occurs, by using (29) and $(K3)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} ||k||_\infty &= \int_{I\!R^N} k(x)w_n^{2^*} dx + o(1) = \int_{I\!R^N\setminus B_{R_0}(0)} k(x)w_n^{2^*} dx + o(1) \\ &\le \sup_{|x|>R_0} |k(x)| \int_{I\!R^N\setminus B_{R_0}(0)} w_n^{2^*} dx + o(1) \le (||k||_\infty - d_0) + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Then the unique possible concentration is at some point $x_0 \in I\!R^N$. Hence we conclude that, up to a subsequence, $r_n \to 0$ and

$$|\nabla u_{r_n}(x-x_n)|^2 \rightharpoonup S\delta_{x_0}.$$

Using (29) it is easy to obtain that $x_0 \in \mathcal{C}(k)$. ■

Remark 4.3. *Notice that as a consequence of the above Lemmas we obtain the existence of at least cat($\tilde{M}(\lambda)$) solutions that eventually can change sign.*

Hereafter we concentrate our study on the analysis of $cat(\tilde{M}(\lambda))$, the behaviour of the energy, and the positivity of solutions.

If R_0 is like in hypothesis $(K3)$, we define

$$\xi(x)=\begin{cases} x & \text{if } |x|\le R_0,\\ R_0\dfrac{x}{|x|} & \text{if } |x|\ge R_0,\end{cases}$$

and for $u\in\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!\!R^N)$ such that $u\neq 0$ we set

$$\Xi(u)=\frac{\int_{I\!\!R^N}\xi(x)|\nabla u|^2dx}{\int_{I\!\!R^N}|\nabla u|^2dx}. \tag{31}$$

We recall that for $u\in\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!\!R^N)$ such that $u\neq 0$ we have $t_\lambda(u)u\in M(\lambda)$ where $t_\lambda(u)$ is given by

$$t_\lambda(u)=\left(\frac{\int_{I\!\!R^N}|\nabla u|^2dx-\lambda\int_{I\!\!R^N}\frac{u^2}{|x|^2}dx}{\int_{I\!\!R^N}k(x)|u|^{2^*}dx}\right)^{\frac{N-2}{4}}.$$

Let $\Psi_\lambda: I\!\!R^N\to\mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!\!R^N)$ be given by

$$\Psi_\lambda(x)=t_\lambda(u_{\mu_\lambda}(\cdot-x))u_{\mu_\lambda}(\cdot-x),$$

where u_{μ_λ} is given by (21), $\mu_\lambda\equiv g(\lambda)$ such that $g(\lambda)\to 0$ as $\lambda\to 0$. Notice that if $x\in\mathcal{C}(k)$ and λ is sufficiently small, then

$$J_\lambda(\Psi_\lambda(x))=\max_{t>0}J_\lambda(tu_{\mu_\lambda}(\cdot-x))\le\frac{1}{N}\frac{S^{N/2}}{||k||_\infty^{\frac{N-2}{2}}}+O(\mu_\lambda^\theta)-c\lambda\mu_\lambda^2<\tilde{c}. \tag{32}$$

Then we can prove the existence of $\lambda_0,c_1,c_2>0$ such that for all $0<\lambda<\lambda_0$ we have $\Psi_\lambda(x)\in\tilde{M}(\lambda)$, $J_\lambda(\Psi_\lambda(x))=\tilde{c}+o(1)$ as $\lambda\to 0$, and $c_1<t_\lambda(u_{\mu_\lambda}(\cdot-x))<c_2$ for all $x\in\mathcal{C}(k)$. As a consequence, taking limits for $\lambda\to 0$ we obtain by Lemma 4.2 that for any $x\in\mathcal{C}(k)$

$$|\nabla\Psi_\lambda(x)|^2\rightharpoonup d\mu=S^{N/2}||k||_\infty^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}\delta_x \text{ and } |\Psi(x)|^{2^*}\rightharpoonup d\nu=(S||k||_\infty^{-1})^{N/2}\delta_x. \tag{33}$$

We prove now the next result.

Lemma 4.4. *For $\lambda\to 0$ we have*

1. $\Xi(\Psi_\lambda(x))=x+o(1)$ *uniformly for* $x\in B_{R_0}(0)$.
2. $\sup\{dist(\Xi(u),\mathcal{C}(k)) : u\in\tilde{M}(\lambda)\}\to 0$.

Proof. Let $x\in B_{R_0}(0)$, then by (33) we obtain that

$$\Xi(\Psi_\lambda(x))=\frac{\int_{I\!\!R^N}\xi(y)|\nabla\Psi_\lambda(x)|^2dy}{\int_{I\!\!R^N}|\nabla\Psi_\lambda(x)|^2dy}=\frac{\int_{I\!\!R^N}\xi(y)d\mu}{\int_{I\!\!R^N}d\mu}+o(1)=x+o(1)\quad\text{as }\lambda\to 0.$$

To prove the second assertion we take $\lambda_n\to 0$ and let $v_n\in\tilde{M}(\lambda_n)$, then by Lemma 4.2 we get the existence of $\{x_n\}\subset I\!\!R^N$ and $\{r_n\}\subset I\!\!R_+$ such that such that $x_n\to x_0\in\mathcal{C}(k), r_n\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$ and

$$v_n-\left(\frac{S}{||k||_\infty}\right)^{\frac{N-2}{4}}u_{r_n}(\cdot-x_n)\to 0 \text{ in } \mathcal{D}^{1,2}(I\!\!R^N).$$

Since Ξ is a continuous function we obtain that

$$\Xi(v_n)=\frac{\int_{I\!\!R^N}\xi(x)|\nabla v_n|^2dx}{\int_{I\!\!R^N}|\nabla v_n|^2dx}=\frac{\int_{I\!\!R^N}\xi(x)|\nabla u_{r_n}(\cdot-x_n)|^2dx}{\int_{I\!\!R^N}|\nabla u_{r_n}(\cdot-x_n)|^2dx}+o(1)=\xi(x_0)+o(1).$$

Since $x_0 \in \mathcal{C}(k) \subset B_{R_0}(0)$ we conclude that $\xi(x_0) = x_0$ and the result follows. ∎

We are now able to prove the main result.

Theorem 4.5. *Assume that hypotheses* $(K0)$, $(K2)$ *and* $(K3)$ *hold and let* $\delta > 0$. *Then there exists* $\lambda_0 > 0$ *such that for all* $0 < \lambda < \lambda_0$, *equation* (14) *has at least* $cat_{\mathcal{C}_\delta(k)}\mathcal{C}(k)$ *solutions.*

Proof. Given $\delta > 0$ there exists $\lambda_0(\delta) > 0$ such that by Lemma 4.4 and (32), for $0 < \lambda < \lambda_0(\delta)$ we have that $\Psi_\lambda(x) \in \tilde{M}(\lambda)$ for any $x \in \mathcal{C}(k)$, and

$$|\Xi(\Psi_\lambda(x)) - x| < \delta \text{ for all } x \in B_{R_0}(0) \text{ and } \Xi(u) \in \mathcal{C}_\delta(k) \text{ for all } u \in \tilde{M}(\lambda).$$

Let $\mathcal{H}(t,x) = x + t(\Xi(\Psi_\lambda(x)) - x)$ where $(t,x) \in [0,1] \times \mathcal{C}(k)$, then $\mathcal{H}$ is a continuous function and $dist(\mathcal{H}(t,x), \mathcal{C}(k)) \leq \delta$ for all $(t,x) \in [0,1] \times \mathcal{C}(k)$. Hence $\mathcal{H}([0,1] \times \mathcal{C}(k)) \subset \mathcal{C}_\delta(k)$.
Since $\mathcal{H}(0,x) = x$ and $\mathcal{H}(1,x) = \Xi(\Psi_\lambda(x))$, then we conclude that $\Xi \circ \Psi_\lambda$ is homotopic to the inclusion $\mathcal{C}(k) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}_\delta(k)$. Since J_λ satisfies the Palais-Smale condition below the level $\tilde{c}$, to prove the Theorem we need just to prove that $cat(\tilde{M}(\lambda)) \geq cat_{\mathcal{C}_\delta(k)}\mathcal{C}(k)$.
Suppose that $\{M_i\}$, $i = 1, ..., n_0$, is a closed covering of $\tilde{M}(\lambda)$, then for any $i = 1, ..., n_0$ there exists a homotopy

$$\mathcal{H}_i : [0,1] \times M_i \to \tilde{M}(\lambda)$$

such that

$$\mathcal{H}_i(0,u) = u \text{ for all } u \in M_i \text{ and } \mathcal{H}_i(1,\cdot) = \text{constant for } i = 1, ..., n_0.$$

Notice that from (32), we obtain that $\Psi_\lambda(\mathcal{C}(k)) \subset \tilde{M}(\lambda)$. We set $\mathcal{C}_i = \Psi_\lambda^{-1}(M_i)$, then $\mathcal{C}_i$ is closed in $\mathcal{C}_\delta(k)$ and $\mathcal{C}(k) \subset \cup_i \mathcal{C}_i \subset \mathcal{C}_\delta(k)$. Then we have just only to show that $\mathcal{C}_i$ are contractible in $\mathcal{C}_\delta(k)$. We set $\mathcal{G}_i : [0,1] \times \mathcal{C}_i \to \mathcal{C}_\delta(k)$ where $\mathcal{G}_i(t,x) = \Xi(\mathcal{H}_i(t, \Psi_\lambda(x)))$. Then

$$\mathcal{G}_i(0,x) = \Xi \circ \Psi_\lambda(x) \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{C}_i \text{ and } \mathcal{G}_i(1,\cdot) = \text{ constant for } i = 1, ..., n_0.$$

Since $\Xi \circ \Psi_\lambda$ is homotopic to the inclusion $\mathcal{C}(k) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}_\delta(k)$ we have that $\mathcal{C}_i$ are contractible in $\mathcal{C}_\delta(k)$. To complete the proof it remains to prove that any solution has a fixed sign. We follow the argument used in [8]. Assume that $u = u^+ - u^-$ with $u^+ \geq 0, u^- \geq 0$ and $u^+ \not\equiv 0, u^- \not\equiv 0$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{I\!R^N} |\nabla u^\pm|^2 dx - \lambda \int_{I\!R^N} \frac{|u^\pm|^2}{|x|^2} dx \geq S(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda_N})^{\frac{N-1}{N}} \Big(\int_{I\!R^N} |u^\pm|^{2^*} dx \Big)^{2/2^*} \\ &\geq S(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda_N})^{\frac{N-1}{N}} ||k||_\infty^{-\frac{2}{2^*}} \Big(\int_{I\!R^N} k(x) |u^\pm|^{2^*} dx \Big)^{2/2^*} \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Since u is a solution to problem (14) we obtain that

$$\int_{I\!R^N} |\nabla u^\pm|^2 dx - \lambda \int_{I\!R^N} \frac{|u^\pm|^2}{|x|^2} dx = \int_{I\!R^N} k(x) |u^\pm|^{2^*} dx. \tag{35}$$

Therefore we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{c} \quad &> \quad J_\lambda(u) = \frac{1}{N} \int_{I\!R^N} k(x) |u|^{2^*} dx = \frac{1}{N} \Big\{ \int_{I\!R^N} k(x) |u^+|^{2^*} dx + \int_{I\!R^N} k(x) |u^-|^{2^*} dx \Big\} \\ &\geq \quad \frac{2S^{\frac{N}{2}}}{N} \left(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda_N}\right)^{\frac{N-1}{2}} ||k||_\infty^{-\frac{N-2}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain $2(1 - \frac{\lambda}{\Lambda_N})^{\frac{N-1}{2}} \leq 1$ which contradicts the choice of λ. ∎

Remark 4.6.

i) *If* $\mathcal{C}(k)$ *is finite, then for* λ *small, equation* (14) *has at least Card*($\mathcal{C}(k)$) *solutions.*

ii) *We give now a typical example where equation* (14) *has infinity many solutions. Let* $\eta : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ *such that* η *is regular,* $\eta(0) = 0$ *and* $\eta(r) = 1$ *for* $r \geq \frac{1}{2}$. *We define* k_1 *on* $[0,1] \subset \mathbb{R}$ *by*

$$k_1(r) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } r = 0, \\ \eta(r)(1 - |\sin(\frac{1}{r-\frac{1}{2}})|^{\theta}) & \text{if } 0 < r \leq 1, \end{cases}$$

where $2 < \theta < N$. *Notice that* k_1 *has infinitely many global maximums archived on the set*

$$\mathcal{C}(k_1) = \left\{ r_n = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{n\pi} \text{ for } n \geq 1 \right\}.$$

Now we define k *to be any continuous bounded function such that* $k(x) = k_1(|x|)$ *if* $|x| \leq 1$, $||k||_{\infty} \leq 1$ *and* $\lim\limits_{|x| \to \infty} k(x) = 0$. *Since for all* $m \in \mathbb{N}$, *there exists* $\delta(m)$ *such that* $cat_{\mathcal{C}_{\delta}(k)}(\mathcal{C}(k)) = m$, *then we conclude that equation* (14) *has at least* m *solutions for* $0 < \lambda < \lambda(\delta)$.

iii) *Let us note that if* δ *becomes larger, then* $cat_{\mathcal{C}_{\delta}(k)}(\mathcal{C}(k))$ *decreases, so that Theorem 4.5 is interesting for* δ *small.*

References

[1] A. Ambrosetti, *Critical points and nonlinear variational problemes*, Mém. Soc. Math. France (N.S.), no. 49 (1992).

[2] A. Ambrosetti, M. Badiale, *Homoclinics: Poincaré-Melnikov type results via a variational approach*, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Analyse Non Linéaire, 15 (1998), 233-252.

[3] A. Ambrosetti, J. García Azorero, I. Peral, *Elliptic variational problems in* $\mathbb{R}^N$ *with critical growth,* J. Diff. Equations, 168 (2000), no. 1, 10-32.

[4] G. Bianchi, J. Chabrowski, A. Szulkin, *On symmetric solutions of an elliptic equation with a nonlinearity involving critical Sobolev exponent,* Nonlinear. Anal. T.M.A, 25 (1995), no. 1, 41-59.

[5] H. Brezis, L. Nirenberg, *Positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equation involving critical exponents,* Comm. Pure. Appl. Math., 36 (1983), no. 4, 437-477.

[6] D. Cao, J. Chabrowski, *Multiple solutions of nonhomogeneous elliptic equation with critical nonlinearity,* Differential Integral Equations, 10 (1997), no. 5, 797-814.

[7] D. Cao, J. Chabrowski, *On the number of positive solutions for nonhomogeneous semilinear elliptic problem,* Adv. Differential Equations, 1 (1996), no. 5, 753-772.

[8] S. Cingolani, M. Lazzo, *Multiple semiclassical standing waves for a class of nonlinear Schrödinger equations,* Top. Methods Nonlinear Anal., 10 (1997), 1-13.

[9] J. García Azorero, I. Peral, *Hardy Inequalities and some critical elliptic and parabolic problems,* J. Diff. Equations, 144 (1998), no. 2, 441-476.

[10] N. Ghoussoub, *Duality and perturbation methods in critical point theory,* Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics (1993).

[11] V. Felli, M. Schneider, *Perturbation results of critical elliptic equations of Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg type,* to appear in J. Diff. Equations.

[12] O. Kavian, *Introduction à la théorie des points critiques et applications aux problèmes elliptiques,* Mathématiques & Applications, 13, Springer-Verlag, Paris, 1993.

[13] P.L. Lions, *The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The limit case, part 1,* Rev. Matemática Iberoamericana, 1 (1985), no. 1, 145-201.

[14] P.L. Lions, *The concentration-compactness principle in the calculus of variations. The limit case, part 2,* Rev. Matemática Iberoamericana, 1 (1985), no. 2, 45-121.

[15] R. Musina, *multiple positive solutions of a scalar field equation in* $I\!R^N$, Top. Methods Nonlinear Anal., 7 (1996), 171-186.
[16] D. Smets, *Nonlinear Schrödinger equations with Hardy potential and critical nonlinearities,* Preprint.
[17] G. Tarantello, *On nonhomogeneous elliptic equations involving critical Sobolev exponent,* Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, 9 (1992), no. 3, 281-304.
[18] S. Terracini, *On positive entire solutions to a class of equations with singular coefficient and critical exponent,* Adv. Diff. Equa., 1 (1996), no. 2, 241-264.
[19] M. Willem, *Minimax theorems*, Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, 24. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1996.

B. Abdellaoui& I. Peral, DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, U. AUTONOMA DE MADRID,
28049 MADRID, SPAIN.
E-mail address: `boumediene.abdellaoui@uam.es, ireneo.peral@uam.es`

V. Felli, S.I.S.S.A., VIA BEIRUT 2-4, 34014 TRIESTE, ITALY
E-mail address: `felli@sissa.it`